

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant and Applicant's attorney express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on June 28, 2006. The amendments and remarks presented herein are consistent with the discussions during that interview. Accordingly, reconsideration of the above-identified application is now respectfully requested.

The Office Action, mailed April 28, 2006, considered claims 1-32, 39-46 and 52-54. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.¹ Claim 8 was objected to as being in improper form for depending from itself. Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24, 26-32, 40-46 and 52-54 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. In addition, the title was objected to as being non-descriptive of the claimed invention, and the specification was objected to for minor typographical errors.

As discussed during the interview, the title of the invention has been amended to more clearly describe the claimed invention, and the specification has now been amended to incorporate language suggested by the Examiner. In addition, claim 8 has been amended to depend from dependent claim 7.

As further discussed at the Interview, and as recited in the claims, the invention is directed to methods and corresponding computer program products for distributing a feature application across a server and node in a network. As recited in claim 1, for example, a node application requested by the node from a central server is loaded at a node. A feature application that includes both a user interface portion and a process portion is then selected for distribution across the node and the central server, and the user interface portion is loaded at the node by the node application. The user interface portion communicates with the process portion which is loaded on the central server and makes a request to the process portion for data. The process portion processes data in response to receipt of the data request and the processed portion is sent

¹ As specifically recited on pp. 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 39 were rejected as vague and indefinite as:

"it is unclear how to *dynamically* distribute a feature application across a node and a central server";
"it is unclear what is the relationship among a feature application and a user interface and a process portion"; and
"it is unclear how is the process portion being used to process data."

to, and received by, the user interface portion from the process portion. The processed data is then presented at the node.

As discussed at the interview, the independent claims have been amended to remove the term "dynamically" from the preamble.² Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the indefiniteness rejection based on use of the term "dynamically" is overcome. As also reflected in the amended claims (e.g., the second act recited after the preamble in claim 1), the feature application comprises the user interface portion and the process portion and, accordingly, the user interface portion and the process portion are subcomponents of the feature application. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the relationship between the feature application and user interface and process portions is not vague or indefinite.

In addition, the amended claims recite wherein a user interface portion makes a data request to the process portion and the process portion, in response to the request made by the user interface portion, processes the data (e.g., accesses the data) and thereafter delivers the data such that it is received by the user interface portion. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims clearly recite that the process portion processes data in response to the user request, and that the claims are not vague or indefinite.

For at least these reasons, and those discussed during the interview, Applicant submits that the claims, particularly as amended, are clear and definite and overcome the objections of record.³ Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections and objections to the other claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise.

² Applicant also submits that the amendment is non-limiting and, if anything, actually broadens the claim inasmuch as the claim includes distribution of a feature application and is not limited to dynamic distribution of such an application.

³ During the interview, claims 8, 16 and 46 were briefly mentioned by the Examiner as they recite "using a behavior to control dynamic content" and the term "behavior" which was believed to possibly be vague and indefinite. Applicant notes that in the specification, the use of behaviors is described at least in original paragraphs 48 and 52. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the term "behavior" is well known term of art, particularly when used to supply dynamic functionality. See, e.g., Dave Massy, Time Off for Good Behavior: DHTML Behaviors in Internet Explorer 5, <http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/default.asp?url=/library/cn-us/dhtmltechcol/dndhtml/IE5behav.asp> (March 18, 1999).

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 28th day of July, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

JCJ:CCN:crb
AHY0000001035V001